

**CALFED Ecosystem Roundtable
Meeting Notes for February 3, 1999**

Roundtable members (or their alternates) and

Liaisons present

Jason Peltier (CVPWA)

Steve Evans (Friends of the River)

Gary Bobker (The Bay Institute)

Amy Fowler (SCVWD)

Hari Modi (NCPA)

John Mills (RCRC)

Dan Keppen (NCWA)

David Yardas (EDF)

Greg Gartrell (CCWD)

Doug Wallace (EBMUD)

Bill Center (Sierra Nevada Alliance)

Patrick Leonard (FWS)

Perry Herrgesell (CDFG)

Carolyn Yale (EPA)

Susan Ramos (BOR)

Roundtable Meeting Schedule and Membership

Tentative future Ecosystem Roundtable meeting dates: March 16, April 22, May 20, June 16, July 22. These are expected to be half day meetings beginning at 9:30am.

CALFED staff are continuing work on a finalized, updated membership of the Roundtable. There is an upcoming memo on this subject.

FY99 Funding Process and Funding Available for Projects

Current available funding for FY 99 is approximately 73 million dollars. A majority of this is federal Bay Delta Act funds. One member requested running totals of funds previously available and their disbursement, in order to track various funding sources and their subsequent utilization. It was also noted that CVPIA manages another approximately 100 million.

Wendy Halverson Martin reviewed the project selection and funding process. There are two parallel paths: Public Solicitation and Designated Actions. Projects for the Designated Actions are identified from Regional Meetings, Stage 1 Actions, ERP goals and objectives, the Strategic Plan and must meet certain criteria. Designated Action criteria include: 1) very high priority actions with substantial investment already made, 2) additional funding in FY99 would result in substantial progress towards ecosystem restoration goals, 3) project was ready to go and the implementing entity identified, 4) also considered ability to leverage additional funds. It was also noted that the Designated Action criteria included that the entity proposing the action was the 'only reasonable group' to be implementing the project. The 1999 Process and Schedule was reviewed. It was also noted that the existing implementation policies are that 75% funding shall be used for actions which benefit listed fish species in the Delta, and that 80% of funds should go toward implementation actions.

Designated Actions

The list of proposed designated actions for 1999 was discussed. There is currently \$52 million allocated to designated actions, and about \$20 million for the Proposal Solicitation. Additional projects will be selected from this solicitation with federal FY 00 monies in October (this will be made clear in the PSP package), thus, the current solicitation will serve to generate potential projects for both FY99 and FY 00 funds.

Battle Creek (DA #1) The funding level was revised as a result of the conclusion of negotiations between the involved parties after the Integration Panel meeting, but the Integration Panel did agree in concept to the project. The Roundtable supported the project with conditions.

- A Principle in Agreement among the parties has been reached and April 16 is a tentative deadline date for completion of the MOU.
- A workshop be conducted to provide information and work out remaining issues for the MOU prior to final decision by the Roundtable.

The Roundtable is generally supportive of the project, given that they participate and agree with the MOU.

ACID Fish Passage Improvement Project, Phase III (DA #4) is a line item in the CVPIA 2002 budget, but is recommended for funding in order to prevent project delays and avoid some of the cost share complications. Concern was raised over the need for an overall cost share policy.

A suggestion for an additional implementation policies was to "better integrate/address a number of criteria, including CALFED/CVPIA coordination, before approving future funding." Dan Keppen, Gary Bobker, David Yargas, and Amy Fowler volunteered for subgroup to work on refining issues and processes to be addressed by the Roundtable in the coming year.

There was discussion about water acquisition funds. Additional bullet items for existing implementation policies include: 1) Roundtable to provide guidance on the FY 98 Water Acquisition Funds, and 2) have the Roundtable involved in the process and have the Integration Panel develop a plan for acquiring flows or spending water acquisition funds.

Stein Buer made a presentation on a request for a designated action associated with Tracy Fish Facility improvements. The Roundtable indicated that this should not be included as a designated action, and should not be taken to the Policy Group.

1999 PSP

Local Involvement: Requirements have been added into this PSP to ensure better local involvement and notification of local entities. An additional suggestion was to encourage applicants to talk to local government. Butte Creek Watershed Conservancy members expressed concern regarding lack of requirement for County or Conservancy approval and support prior to proposal submittal.

Federal Bay-Delta Act Funds for Special Support Programs

Steve Ritchie requested Roundtable support for Special Support Funds in FY99. Roundtable comments included 1) condition to fully funding the development of the Ecosystem Restoration Program Strategic Plan with FY99 funds, and 2) using alternative funds in the water quality section for activities that are 100% related to drinking water.

Sacramento/San Joaquin River Basin Comprehensive Study Briefing

Mike Bonner (ACOE) and Steve Yaeger (DWR) provided a briefing on the status of the Sacramento/San Joaquin River Basin Comprehensive Study.

Implementation and Tracking Discussion

A handout provided of current tracking data for restoration projects (CALFED and others). Another source of information is the Bureau's TERA system on the web at www.tera.mp.usbr.gov

Administrative Costs

Liz Howard provided an overview of USBR administrative costs. Costs are characterized as administration (USBR overseeing Bay-Delta Act), Program Management (costs associated with managing a program), and Project Management (costs associated with a specific project). USBR administrative costs are currently less than 3% of the project funds. It was suggested that this presentation be included as a future agenda item. Concerns were expressed regarding "layering" of administrative costs, since many oversight groups/agencies (e.g. CALFED, USBR, USFWS, Conservancies, County, etc.) may get involved in a particular project/program.

Public Comment

Concerns were expressed regarding quarterly reports, and the associated data needs and effort required. Another item was raised regarding the amendment process, and it was noted that the process is allowing problems with contract award delays to be addressed with a minimum of difficulty.